

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is requested. The specification has been amended in ¶17 as suggested by the examiner. The grammatical error in Claim 11 has been corrected as suggested by the examiner. The incorrect dependency of Claim 14 has been corrected as suggested by the examiner.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, regarding the term “and/or.” Claims 9 and 19 have been amended to eliminate the “and/or” limitation. Support for the amendment to Claims 9 and 19 is found in ¶18 of the subject application. This part of the specification indicates that the encapsulation layer 42 can serve as a bonding layer between the optoelectronic device 34 and the penetrator 32. Accordingly, withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of Claims 9 and 19 is requested.

In the first Office Action, the examiner indicated that dependent Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 5 and Claim 5 has been canceled. Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 15 and Claim 15 has been cancelled. Claim 21 has been canceled. New Claim 22 has been added which represents a combination of original Claims 1 and 4. New Claim 23 has been added which represents a combination of original Claims 11 and 14.

Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-20, 22 and 23 are allowable and notification to this effect is solicited. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 50-1078 for the required fees for one additional independent claim in excess of three and for any additional charge due in connection with this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

 1-20-05

By: Michael H. Jester  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 28,022